

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the present patent application based on the following remarks are respectfully requested.

By this Amendment, claims 1, 10, 17, 20 and 21 are amended and claims 26-27 are newly added. Support for the amendment to the claims and new claims 26-27 may be found throughout the original disclosure. No new matter has been added. Accordingly, after entry of this Amendment, claims 1-25 will remain pending in the patent application. Since this Amendment is being presented together with a Request for Continued Examination, entry of this Amendment is respectfully requested.

The specification was objected to as allegedly failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

In connection with the rejection, the Examiner asserts that the language “around the wiring harness, to simultaneously” is not adequately supported in the specification. Applicant strenuously disagrees.

First, “[t]here is no requirement that the words in the claim ***must match*** those used in the specification disclosure” and that “Applicants are given a great deal of latitude in how they choose to define their invention so long as the terms and phrases used define the invention with a reasonable degree of clarity and precision.” See MPEP 2173.05(e). MPEP 2163.02 also states that “[t]he subject matter of the claim need not be described literally (i.e., using the same terms or *in haec verba*) in order for the disclosure to satisfy the description requirement.” Furthermore, “an Applicant shows possession of the claimed invention by describing the claimed invention with all of its limitations using such descriptive means as ***words, structures, figures, diagrams*** and formulas that fully set forth the claimed invention.” (See MPEP 2163 citing Lockwood v. American Airlines, Inc., 107 F.3d 1565, 1572, 41 USPQ2d 1961, 1966 (Fed. Cir. 1997), emphasis added).

With this said, the drawings and the text of the specification fully support the limitation “around the wiring harness, to simultaneously”. For example, the Examiner’s attention is directed to FIGS. 1 and 2 and page 6, lines 5-16 of the present application for support for this recitation. As shown in FIGS. 1 and 2, the body 13 is molded on the wiring harness 25 in a specific manner. That is, the molded body 13 is molded on the wiring harness 25 to completely encapsulate the wiring harness 25 and provide access to the connectors 19a-f at the same time. As such, the body 13 is adapted to simultaneously provide these features, i.e. encapsulating the wiring harness 25 and providing access to the connectors.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to the specification are respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1-25 were objected to. The objection is respectfully traversed.

In connection with the objection, the Examiner asserts that the language “around the wiring harness, to simultaneously” is not adequately supported in the specification. As indicated above, there is clear support for this recitation in the original disclosure.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to claims 1-25 are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-2, 6-7, 11-22 and 24-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) based on Hull *et al.* (U.S. Pub. No. 2005/0072589) (hereinafter “Hull”) in view of Lockwood *et al.* (U.S. Pat. No. 5,013,872) (hereinafter “Lockwood”). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 recites an electronic assembly, which comprises “a wiring harness; connectors connected to the wiring harness; and, a body molded on the wiring harness to, simultaneously, completely encapsulate the wiring harness and provide access to the connectors.” The combination of Hull and Lockwood fails to present a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

By way of review, the cited portions of Hull disclose a mud box A for use in poured concrete construction. *See* Hull at paragraph 1. The mud box A of Hull is a molded box that has three exterior connectors that extend outwardly from each sidewall of the box. *See* Hull at FIG. 1 and paragraph 29. Hull discloses that the molded box is an empty box that is open on the front side thereof. *Id.*

The Examiner concedes that the cited portions of Hull do not disclose, teach or suggest a wiring harness and a body formed around the wiring harness to, simultaneously, completely encapsulate the wiring harness. However, there are additional features that are absent in the cited portions of Hull.

For example, the cited portions of Hull do not disclose, teach or suggest a body molded on the wiring harness to, simultaneously, completely encapsulate the wiring harness and provide access to the connectors. Unlike the body of claim 1, the mud box A of Hull is not molded on anything, let alone a wiring harness. Rather, the mud box A of Hull is merely a molded empty box that may contain an object.

The cited portions of Lockwood fail to remedy the deficiencies of Hull. The cited portions of Lockwood disclose an electrical box 10 having walls 12 defining an housing 14 that houses conductor wires 20 (identified by the Office Action as the “wiring harness” of

claim 1). *See* Lockwood at col. 2, lines 30-32 and FIG. 1. However, unlike the body of claim 1, the electrical box 10 is not molded on the conductor wires 20. Quite to the contrary, the cited portions of Lockwood disclose that the electrical “box 10 is designed to receive one or more electrical cables 16 for connection to other cables”, the cables 16 including the conductor wires 20. Nowhere do the cited portions of Lockwood remotely disclose, teach or suggest a body molded on the conductor wires. Accordingly, any proper combination of Hull and Lockwood cannot result, in any way, in the invention of claim 1.

Claims 2, 6-7, 11-16 and 24-25 are patentable over the cited portions of Hull, Lockwood and any proper combination thereof at least by virtue of their dependency from claim 1 and for the additional features recited therein.

Claims 17 is patentable over the cited portions of Hull, Lockwood and any proper combination thereof for at least the same reasons as provided above for claim 1 and for the features recited therein. For example, the cited portions of Hull, Lockwood and any proper combination thereof do not disclose, teach or suggest an electronic assembly comprising, *inter alia*, “a body molded on the wiring harness to, simultaneously, completely encapsulate said wiring harness and to cover a portion of each of said plurality of connectors so as to provide access to each of the plurality of connectors.”

Claims 18-19 are patentable over the cited portions of Hull, Lockwood and any proper combination thereof at least by virtue of their dependency from claim 17 and for the additional features recited therein.

Claim 20 is patentable over the cited portions of Hull, Lockwood and any proper combination thereof for at least the same reasons as provided above for claim 1 and for the features recited therein. For example, the cited portions of Hull, Lockwood and any proper combination thereof do not disclose, teach or suggest an electronic assembly comprising, *inter alia*, “a body molded on the wiring harness to, simultaneously, completely encapsulate said wiring harness and to cover a portion of each of said plurality of connectors so as to provide access to each of the plurality of connectors, said molded body including a base portion that extends between said plurality of connectors.”

Claim 21 is patentable over the cited portions of Hull, Lockwood and any proper combination thereof for at least the same reasons as provided above for claim 1 and for the features recited therein. For example, the cited portions of Hull, Lockwood and any proper combination thereof do not disclose, teach or suggest an electronic assembly comprising, *inter alia*, “a body molded on the wiring harness to, simultaneously, completely encapsulate

said wiring harness and to cover a portion of each of said plurality of connectors so as to provide access to each of the plurality of connectors.”

Claims 22-23 are patentable over the cited portions of Hull, Lockwood and any proper combination thereof at least by virtue of their dependency from claim 21 and for the additional features recited therein.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-2, 6-7, 11-22 and 24-25 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) based on Hull in view of Rockwood are respectfully requested.

Claims 3-5 and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) based on Hull in view of Becker (U.S. Pat. No. 5,207,989). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 3-5 are patentable over the cited portions of Hull at least by virtue of their dependency from claim 1 and for the additional features recited therein. As noted above, for example, the cited portions of Hull do not disclose, teach or suggest an electronic assembly, which comprises, *inter alia*, “a body molded on the wiring harness to, simultaneously, completely encapsulate the wiring harness and provide access to the connectors.”

The cited portions of Becker do not remedy the deficiencies of Hull. The cited portions of Becker merely disclose a container for packaging electronic components which are susceptible to damage from electrostatic discharge or fields. *See* Becker at col. 1, lines 58-63. However, the cited portions of Becker are silent as to an electronic assembly, which comprises, *inter alia*, “a body molded on the wiring harness to, simultaneously, completely encapsulate the wiring harness and provide access to the connectors,” as in claims 3-5. Therefore, any proper combination of the cited portions of Hull and Becker cannot result, in any way, in the invention of claims 3-5.

Claim 23 is patentable over the cited portions of Hull at least by virtue of its dependency from claim 1 and for the additional features recited therein. As noted above, for example, the cited portions of Hull do not disclose, teach or suggest an electronic assembly, which comprises, *inter alia*, “a body molded on the wiring harness to, simultaneously, completely encapsulate said wiring harness and to cover a portion of each of said plurality of connectors so as to provide access to each of the plurality of connectors.”

The cited portions of Becker do not remedy the deficiencies of Hull. Therefore, any proper combination of the cited portions of Hull and Becker cannot result, in any way, in the invention of claim 23.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 3-5 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) based on Hull in view of Becker are respectfully requested.

Claims 8-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) based on Hull in view of Morrow (U.S. Pat. No. 5,541,457). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 8-10 are patentable over the cited portions of Hull at least by virtue of their dependency from claim 1 and for the additional features recited therein. As noted above, for example, the cited portions of Hull do not disclose, teach or suggest an electronic assembly, which comprises, *inter alia*, “a body molded on the wiring harness to, simultaneously, completely encapsulate the wiring harness and provide access to the connectors.”

The cited portions of Morrow do not remedy the deficiencies of Hull. The cited portions of Morrow merely disclose a container 10 that receives various components. *See* Morrow at FIG. 3. However, the cited portions of Morrow are silent as to an electronic assembly, which comprises, *inter alia*, “a body molded on the wiring harness to, simultaneously, completely encapsulate the wiring harness and provide access to the connectors,” as in claims 8-10. Therefore, any proper combination of the cited portions of Hull and Morrow cannot result, in any way, in the invention of claims 8-10.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 8-10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) based on Hull in view of Morrow are respectfully requested.

Claims 26 and 27 are newly added and define additional subject matter that is novel and non-obvious over the art of record. Claims 26 and 27 are patentable over the art of record at least by virtue of their dependency from claim 1 and for the additional features recited therein.

Applicant has addressed the Examiner’s rejections and objections and respectfully submits that the application is in condition for allowance. A notice to that effect is earnestly solicited. If any point remains in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, please contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

MARSH ET AL. -- 10/761,815
Client/Matter: 017058-0307819

Please charge any fees associated with the submission of this paper to Deposit Account Number 033975. The Commissioner for Patents is also authorized to credit any over payments to the above-referenced Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN LLP



CHRISTOPHE F. LAIR

Reg. No. 54248

Tel. No. 703.770.7797

Fax No. 703.770.7901

JSB/CFL/smm
P.O. Box 10500
McLean, VA 22102
(703) 770-7900